

ANDREW M. BATEMAN Deputy Chief Counsel for ORS

Office of Regulatory Staff 1401 Main Street Suite 900 Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 737-0800 ORS.SC.GOV

June 27, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Jocelyn G. Boyd, Esquire Chief Clerk & Administrator Public Service Commission of South Carolina 101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100 Columbia, South Carolina 29210

Re:

Application of Duke Energy Progress, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order

Docket No. 2018-318-E

Dear Ms. Boyd:

In its Petition for Reconsideration, Duke Energy Progress, LLC ("DEP" or the "Company") sought reconsideration of Commission Order No. 2019-341 with regards to the Commission's decision to disallow recovery of the CertainTEED litigation costs. (Pet. p. 14.) The Company's CertainTEED litigation costs were included in Adjustment #36 but were not specifically identified or broken out. In its June 19, 2019 directive, the Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") granted the Company's request as it related to recovery of the CertainTEED litigation costs and determined that DEP shall be entitled to recover \$830,000. The Record in this case reflects that \$830,000 is the yearly dollar settlement amount of the Ongoing Payment Obligation to CertainTEED provided for in Adjustment #38.

It is the position of ORS that the actual dollar value of the CertainTEED Litigation costs could not be determined based on the evidence presented by the Company or any evidence of record. (*See* Tr. pp. 1308-1309).

Letter – Jocelyn G. Boyd, Esquire Page 2 of 2 June 27, 2019

ORS respectfully requests clarification as to whether the Commission intends to allow the Company to recover \$830,000 based on the Company's On-Going Payment Obligation to CertainTEED provided in Adjustment #38, CertainTEED-related litigation expenses included in Adjustment #36, or both.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Bateman

cc: All Parties of Record (via E-mail)
Joseph Melchers, Esquire (via E-mail)